

Algorithms under review.

A reviewable evidence account of a public Woo disclosure concerning Algemene Rekenkamer research into algorithms.

REVIEWED

DOSSIER ID	PUBLICATION	AUTHORITY
PD-WOO-OCW-2024-001	21 February 2024	Ministry of OCW

SOURCE	CLAIM	REVIEW	PROOFDOSSIER
04 public records	06 material claims	05 recorded controls	01 portable dossier

Release boundary. Independent ProofLabs demonstration using public material. No government endorsement is implied. This document records provenance, claim support, open questions and review state; it does not provide a legal conclusion.

One public disclosure, made independently reviewable.

The official publication explains what was released. This ProofDossier adds a visible evidence structure: which public record supports which material statement, which questions remain open, and what a reviewer approved for release.

PRIMARY RECORDS 04 Official public set	MATERIAL CLAIMS 06 Source-bound wording	OPEN QUESTIONS 02 Not hidden	REVIEW STEPS 05 Recorded controls
---	--	---	--

Decision question

What was published, which conclusions can be supported by which record, and where does the evidence boundary end?

WHAT THIS DOSSIER ESTABLISHES	WHAT IT DELIBERATELY DOES NOT ESTABLISH
- A bounded public source set - A six-claim register - Explicit source-to-claim links - Two visible scope questions - A recorded release boundary	- No legal or fairness assessment - No claim that the public package is the authority's complete internal file - No government endorsement - No substitution for the original publication

Reader guidance. Start with the source register, then inspect the claim register. The matrix shows the exact support pattern. Finish with the scope review and release log before relying on any statement outside this demonstration.

A bounded evidence product, not a black-box answer.

The dossier follows a five-control route. Each control produces a reviewable object and preserves uncertainty rather than compressing it into one score.

CONTROL	STEP	PURPOSE	OUTPUT
01	Decision question	Defines what must be supported and what remains outside scope.	Scope card
02	Source register	Records provenance, publisher, date, rights and retrieval route.	Source inventory
03	Claim map	Connects each material statement to support, qualification or a gap.	Claim-evidence map
04	Human review	Records acceptance, limitation or open status with a stated reason.	Review log
05	Controlled release	Packages only the reviewed set with its boundary and reference route.	ProofDossier PDF

State vocabulary

SUPPORTED

The cited public record supports the bounded wording used here.

SCOPED

Part of the statement is supported, but a wider interpretation would exceed the record.

OPEN

The public package does not establish the proposition. A next evidence step is recorded.

Core rule. A state describes what this public source set supports. It is not a verdict on whether an algorithm is lawful, fair, desirable or correctly implemented.

Every record stays one step from its publisher.

Stable source IDs make the claim map readable. They supplement the authority's publication and inventory; they never replace them.

ID	RECORD	ROLE	STATUS
SRC-001	Rijksoverheid publication page	Provenance anchor and public retrieval route	PUBLIC
SRC-002	Woo decision	Decision record published by OCW	PUBLIC
SRC-003	Inventory and appendices	Scope index for the disclosed record set	PUBLIC
SRC-004	Disclosed records package	Underlying public evidence material	PUBLIC

Primary provenance anchor



Rijksoverheid / Ministry of Education, Culture and Science
Decision on a Woo request concerning Algemene Rekenkamer research into algorithms.

Published: 21 February 2024
Rights state: Publicly retrievable
Verify online: [open the official publication](#)

Retrieval note. Public web pages and downloadable files may change location. A reviewer should use the authority page above as the canonical starting point and compare the current inventory with the four source roles recorded in this dossier.

Six material statements, each with an explicit evidence state.

The wording below is deliberately narrower than a general conclusion about algorithms. States must be read together with the cited source IDs and the scope review.

CLAIM	MATERIAL STATEMENT	EVIDENCE	STATE
CLM-001 Learning status	The school-risk signalling model was deliberately described as a non-learning expert model.	SRC-002, SRC-004	SUPPORTED
CLM-002 Data provenance	The described model uses education-register data supplemented with CBS indicators.	SRC-002, SRC-004	SUPPORTED
CLM-003 Automation boundary	The public record supports automation for sample selection. It does not by itself establish a fully automated final substantive decision.	SRC-002, SRC-003	SCOPED
CLM-004 Legal-rule binding	A released response states that an algorithm follows indicators established in legislation and regulation.	SRC-004	SUPPORTED
CLM-005 Field-level inventory	The cited public package does not establish one complete and stable list of data elements across every described application.	SRC-003, SRC-004	OPEN
CLM-006 Model ownership	The records describe different ownership boundaries for DUO-built models and supplier-package algorithms.	SRC-003, SRC-004	SCOPED

Important: SUPPORTED means supported by the bounded public record for the wording used. SCOPED means a broader reading is not supported. OPEN means the public package leaves a material question unresolved.

The support pattern is visible at a glance.

An X records that the source is used for the claim. It does not imply that every source independently proves every word, nor that absence of an X disproves the proposition.

CLAIM	SRC-001	SRC-002	SRC-003	SRC-004	STATE
CLM-001	-	X	-	X	SUPPORTED
CLM-002	-	X	-	X	SUPPORTED
CLM-003	-	X	X	-	SCOPED
CLM-004	-	-	-	X	SUPPORTED
CLM-005	-	-	X	X	OPEN
CLM-006	-	-	X	X	SCOPED

HOW TO READ THIS

CLM-001 and CLM-002 rely on the released decision and disclosed response material. **CLM-003** is deliberately scoped because the record supports automation of selection, not automatically the final decision. **CLM-005** remains open because the package does not establish one complete cross-application field inventory.

Evidence density is not truth

More source links do not automatically make a claim stronger. Reliability depends on record quality, exact wording, context, contradiction review and the decision boundary. This dossier therefore keeps the state label and reviewer note as first-class information.

The strongest dossier shows the edge of its evidence.

These are precise questions left open by the bounded public record. They are not invented contradictions.

SCQ-001 / AUTOMATION BOUNDARY

OPEN SCOPE

Does 'fully automated' apply only to sample selection, or also to a final substantive decision?

Evidence basis

The released passage supports a decision tree that determines whether a case enters a sample. It does not by itself establish that the final substantive decision is fully automated.

Next evidence step

Link the published process image and the authoritative decision-procedure record before widening the claim.

SCQ-002 / DATA-ELEMENT COVERAGE

EVIDENCE GAP

Is there one complete and stable field list across every application described in the package?

Evidence basis

The public record contains descriptions and examples, but this dossier does not identify one stable cross-application field inventory that supports that wider proposition.

Next evidence step

Obtain an authoritative versioned field inventory for each application and reconcile differences.

Review rule. An open question remains visible until a cited record and human decision justify changing its state. Silence is never treated as support.

Human judgement remains visible and accountable.

The log records the controls applied to this public demonstration. It does not imply qualified legal, technical or policy review by the publishing authority.

ID	CONTROL	DECISION NOTE	STATE
REV-001	Provenance	Official publication route and date recorded.	ACCEPTED
REV-002	Publication rights	Material classified as publicly retrievable.	PUBLIC
REV-003	Claim support	Six material statements assigned explicit states.	REVIEWED
REV-004	Scope boundary	Two material questions kept open with next steps.	RECORDED
REV-005	Release pack	PDF includes sources, claims, matrix, review log and boundary.	READY

RELEASE DECISION	BOUNDARY
Approved as a public-source method demonstration.	May be used to inspect the ProofLabs/OpenDossier evidence method. May not be represented as an authority-endorsed legal, fairness or implementation assessment.

Review identity

Prepared and released by ProofLabs as an independent public-source demonstration. The visible status 'Reviewed' refers to the internal evidence controls listed above, not to endorsement or review by OCW, DUO, the Algemene Rekenkamer or another public body.

A reviewer can retrace the route without the source application.

Use the steps below to reproduce the public-source check. The official publisher remains the authority for the source material; this PDF remains an independent evidence map.

01	Open the official publication Use the QR code or publisher link and confirm the authority and publication date.
02	Inspect the listed downloads Compare the current public inventory with SRC-001 through SRC-004.
03	Test each claim Read the wording in the claim register, then inspect only the linked source IDs.
04	Challenge scope Check whether a broader interpretation would exceed the cited public record.
05	Read the release boundary Do not reuse a statement without carrying its state and limitation.



Canonical public starting point

Rijksoverheid - Besluit op Woo-verzoek onderzoeken Algemene Rekenkamer over algoritmes

[Open the official publication](#)

Document release: 1.0
Generated: 2026-08-27
Dossier ID: PD-W00-OCW-2024-001
Classification: PUBLIC-SOURCE DEMONSTRATION
Publisher: ProofLabs
Method boundary: Evidence map and review record; no automated truth or legal conclusion.